

REMARKS

The Office Action dated May 28, 2009 has been received and carefully noted. The above amendments and following remarks are being submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

Claims 1, 4-6 and 15-16 are pending. By this Amendment, Claim 1 is amended. Replacement Sheets of formal drawing Figures 1, 2A, 2B, 4 and 5 are submitted. Support for the amendments to the claims may be found in the application as originally filed. Applicants respectfully submit that no new subject matter is presented herein. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. 1.84(p)(4) due to various inconsistencies. A detailed explanation of the amendments to the appropriate Figures is as follows:

The drawings are objected to because reference characters "22" and "24" have been used in Figures 4 and 5 to illustrate what are considered to be different configurations of the shaft tooth section 22 and the shaft shank 24 depicted in Figure 3. Accordingly, Figures 4 and 5 have been amended to use reference characters 22', 22'' and 24', 24'', respectively, to reference various aspects of the shaft tooth section 22 and the shaft shank 24.

The drawings are objected to because Figure 2B shows the splines of the hub being closer than those in Figure 2A, Figure 2B contains extraneous text, reference character 28 in Figures 2A and 2B should be deleted as there is only one hub tooth

section in the hub, the maximum tooth thickness at the crowning top should be clearly identified, and the plane upon which sectional view, Figure 2A, is taken should be indicated on the view from which the section is cut. Figure 2B has been amended to correct the spacing of the splines of the hub as suggested by the Examiner, and the extraneous text in Figure 2B has been removed. The duplicate reference character 28 has been removed from Figures 2A and 2B, and the point of maximum tooth thickness at the crowning top P0 has been more clearly illustrated in Figures 2A and 2B. A cross-sectional view line A-A has been added to Figure 1 to indicate the sectional view illustrated in Figures 2A and 2B.

With respect to the Examiner's comment on page 3, last paragraph, that "it is unclear why the loads a-c overlap and drawn with circles," Applicants respectfully submit that Figure 2B shows what is described clearly in the specification as originally filed from page 21, line 7, to page 22, line 1, such that one of ordinary skill in the art would easily understand the subject matter of the application.

Enclosed herein are Replacement Sheets of formal drawing Figures 1, 2A, 2B, 4 and 5, which have corrected the drawings in a manner believed to fully address the basis of the objections. As such, the Applicants respectfully submit that any structural detail that is essential for a proper understanding of the disclosed invention as specified in the claims is shown in the drawings.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objections to the drawings.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants respectfully acknowledge and appreciate the indication by the Examiner that Claim 1 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the

rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, and Claims 4-6 and 15-16 would thus be allowable for depending from Claim 1.

In this regard, Claim 1 has been amended in a manner believed to be responsive to the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, and Applicants respectfully submit Claim 1 is believed to now be in condition for allowance. Claims 4-6, 15 and 16 depend from Claim 1. It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons Claim 1 is now allowable as well as for the additional subject matter recited therein.

Withdrawal of the objection to Claims 1, 4-6, 15 and 16 is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1, 4-6, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. The Examiner has noted an inconsistency between the language in the preamble of Claim 1 and a certain portion in the body of the claim, thereby making the scope of the claim unclear. Applicants have amended Claim 1 in a manner believed to be responsive to the rejection. In particular, the Applicants have amended Claim 1 to recite that the power transmission mechanism does comprise a hub and a shaft. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.


Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration of the application, withdrawal of the outstanding objections and rejection, allowance of Claims 1, 4-6, 15 and 16, and the prompt issuance of a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension, together with any additional fees that may be due with respect to this paper, may be charged to counsel's Deposit Account No. 01-2300, **referencing Attorney Docket Number 025416.00026.**

Respectfully submitted,



William D. Doyle
Registration No. 60,429

Enclosures: Replacement Sheets of Formal Drawings Figures 1, 2A, 2B, 4 and 5

Customer No. 004372

ARENT FOX LLP

1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 400

Washington, D.C. 20036-5339

Tel: (202) 857-6000

Fax: (202) 638-4810

WDD:elp